

COT MEETING MINUTES

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

Friday, September 24, 2010

10:00 AM - 12:00 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

CONFERENCE ROOM 345A/B

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
Robert Brutinel
Andrew Hurwitz, *Chair*
Michael Jeanes
Dennis Kavanaugh (*Paul Thomas, proxy*)
Gary Krcmarik
Sheri Newman
Catherine O'Grady
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
John Rezzo
Delcy Scull
Roxanne Song Ong
Ann Timmer
Garye Vasquez*

GUESTS

Steve Ballance, TAC
Randy Durow, *TOLLPLUS Inc.*
Hon. Andrew Gould, *Yuma Superior Court* *
Rona Newton, *PACC/CACC*
Michael Pollard, *CACC*
Jamie Ross, *Courthouse News*
David Stevens, *TAC/PACC*
Nathan Wade, *Tag Messenger*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Anabel Abarca

AOC STAFF

Theresa Barrett, *CSD*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Jennifer Greene, *Legal*
Karl Heckart, *ITD/TAC*
Patrick McGrath, *CSD*
Bob Macon, *ITD*
Adele May, *ITD*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*
Renny Rapier, *ITD*
Amy Somma, *ITD*

* indicates attendance by telephone

COT MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Hon. Andrew Hurwitz,
Chair

Vice Chief Justice Andrew Hurwitz, Chair, called the Commission on Technology (COT) meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. He welcomed members and the public present, then asked those calling in and all members in the room to introduce themselves for the record. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed. Justice Hurwitz then called members' attention to the minutes from the May 6, 2010, annual planning meeting.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2010, Commission on Technology meeting with the proposed revisions incorporated. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 10-11

STRATEGIC PROJECTS UPDATE

Mr. Karl Heckart

Mr. Karl Heckart, CIO for the Courts, provided members with brief updates on progress and issues with e-filing implementation projects underway including civil subsequent filings in Maricopa Superior Court, full civil e-filing in the Maricopa Justice Courts and Pima Superior Court, and e-filing of all case types in the Appellate Courts. Karl reminded members that e-filing is a pinnacle application that sits atop various other automation systems and requires integration on many levels, resources from various courts and roles, as well as business process changes. He warned that the project is complex and will be evolving for years to come. It also prompts examination of the reasons courts perform work the way they do. He elaborated on the "no rejection" policy discussion to illustrate the differences between the way things happen in the paper world and the way they happen in the electronic world.

Karl described progress being made on the large goal of digitizing the courts through the central document repository and related upgrades of the OnBase software in local courts, limited jurisdiction courts' central EDMS, the improved EDMS statewide support contract, and standardizing OnBase keywords across systems. He also described discussions underway related to technical and business practices related to processing electronic citations, triggered by DPS's decision to make the Iowa TRACS software available to local law enforcement agencies throughout the state. Karl will facilitate a focus group to walk through the entire process and determine the necessary requirements going forward. Decisions will affect the cost, storage requirements, and the number of processing steps needed for the citations.

On the AJACS front, Karl brought members up to date on the limited jurisdiction (LJ) development items underway and preliminary preparations for the rollout to AZTEC courts, the general jurisdiction enhancements being pursued in the reporting area with the resulting need to clean up the data driving the reports, and the formation of an AOC financial/accounting team to address systemic problems. Judge Andrew Gould described the work of the calendaring/scheduling re-engineering group and their efforts to boil hundreds of issues down to ten core items. He called attention to the fact that individual court business processes continue to vary widely around the state, but he feels support and momentum exist for making key changes to AJACS to facilitate all courts' use of the automated calendar function. Meetings will be held in

COT MEETING MINUTES

October to discuss the direction with superior court representatives and presiding judges. Justice Hurwitz commended Judge Gould and the group for tackling a very large subject quickly. Members commented that the presiding judges need to be informed of the many “downstream” implications of not using the AJACS calendaring function statewide.

Karl pointed out that the work required in AJACS would be substantial and added to other enhancements already planned for delivery. He showed a graphic illustrating the move of rural court e-filing and probation integration functionality to a later release in order to ensure disposition reporting and calendar/schedule enhancements get in the field rapidly. Justice Hurwitz acknowledged that the later timeline for rural court e-filing might better align with the various preparatory activities that need to be accomplished.

SUPREME COURT RULE 124 ISSUES

Mr. Stewart Bruner

Justice Hurwitz set the stage for the discussion by recounting the highly interconnected nature of automation systems and policies. Staff member Stewart Bruner provided background on changes to the existing rule in preparation for review of the proposed revisions at the November meeting. He explained changes in the approach to electronic filing since the Year 2000 that warrant adoption of a new set of policies to support a unified statewide approach. Details are being placed in a new code section that will also need to be approved concurrent with the rule changes.

Stewart briefly described the review process and timeline leading to consideration at the August 2011 Rules Agenda and an effective date of January 1, 2012. Standing committees of the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) are being consulted prior to beginning the official rule comment process in January 2011. In response to a members’ question, Stewart affirmed that Melinda Hardman has been in contact with the State Bar and that the Civil Practice Committee will be asked for their comments ahead of the official rules petition posting.

BRANCH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN FOR FY11-13

Mr. Stewart Bruner

Mr. Stewart Bruner, Manager of Strategic Planning for the Information Technology Division (ITD) of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), reviewed the process of developing the branchwide plan and the major areas updated in the latest iteration. He described his approach to translating Karl Heckart’s graphic of priorities approved at the annual meeting into a tabular format for use in the plan. Various detailed projects have been added and others combined or removed, based on input for project managers at the AOC. The document was posted on September 10 for review and comment by members. The only comments received were editorial in nature.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Arizona Judicial Branch Information Technology Strategic Plan for 2011-2013, with the recommended changes incorporated before submission to GITA and JLBC. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 10-12

COT MEETING MINUTES

The focus turned to the general direction being pursued for creation of next year's plan. Stewart pointed out that everyone agrees that courts need to be deliberate about their use of funds and resources on technology, but there is not a consensus about how often a formal, written plan needs to be updated. He stated his expectation that the urban counties would submit complete plans next year since they have so many resources and so many projects underway. Details about the approach and frequency for updating plans in the rural courts will be discussed at the November meeting.

CACC PROJECT COORDINATION DETAILS

Hon. Michael Pollard

Justice Hurwitz set the stage by reminding members of the local, foundational projects on which statewide projects depend and the need to obtain information about their progress without interfering in their management. Judge Michael Pollard, chair of the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC), reviewed the direction members provided at the annual meeting. He outlined the steps taken to act on that direction over the summer including discontinuing the dashboard review, coordinating the CMS implementations, coordinating with the Probation Automation Coordinating Committee (PACC), and capturing dependencies among strategic projects and their supporting business deliverables using a graphic tool.

Judge Pollard displayed a graphic representation of the dependencies AZTurboCourt has on obtaining data for validation of cases from several individual case management systems, taken from the more complex MindMap. CACC requests from COT the ability to call project managers to discuss the issues with dependencies in a collaborative attempt to bring together the various projects underway. Project managers will be invited to the October CACC meeting to discuss CACC's expectations for reporting in the future. The approach to increasing coordination depends on local project managers' responding to CACC's request for updates about the projects on which statewide projects depend. This need fueled the wording of the proposed motion.

A question was raised about efforts on statewide standardization of court forms by case type. Karl pointed out the difference between intelligent, fillable forms and capture of basic information that accompanies document filings and stated that standardization is driven by the AZTurboCourt initiative.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to direct CACC to continue its monitoring strategy to track interrelationships among automation projects within the trial courts and obtain updates from court project managers, as requested. The motion passed unanimously.

TECH 10-13

PACC UPDATED DIRECTION

Ms. Rona Newton

Ms. Rona Newton, chair of PACC, returned to update members on the refinement in approach PACC has taken since the annual meeting. She confirmed that Committee on Probation (COP) has contributed additional membership to PACC and is comfortable with the general process Rona proposed for collecting any issues related to probation automation. Rona then described

COT MEETING MINUTES

the repeatable cycle for obtaining and feeding back details of technical issues. PACC meetings are now being scheduled in relationship to the dates of COP meetings. The goal is to move discussion at PACC away from reports about projects in favor of a more issues and resolutions oriented discussion.

UPDATED JUDICIAL PROJECT INVESTMENT JUSTIFICATION DOCUMENT

Mr. Karl Heckart

Karl briefly summarized the history of the Judicial Project Investment Justification Document (JPIJ), especially how it was based on the Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) PIJ. GITA made sweeping changes effective July 1, so it makes sense to reexamine the JPIJ in light of those refinements. Stewart analyzed the changes and has proposed a set that were reasonable and served to streamline the JPIJ overall. Though changes aren't extensive, the amount of redline warrants some detailed review, so no approval is being requested in this meeting. The topic will be placed on the November agenda, giving members time to digest the proposed changes.

A concern was raised about collecting information about project dependencies as requested by CACC. Karl pointed out that the JPIJ itself is not submitted directly to GITA and delved into the larger purpose of the JPIJ as a mechanism for having managers of projects expending significant resources as well as the branch leadership think through the implications of the project.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Hon. Andrew Hurwitz

After hearing no request for further discussion from members or the public in response to his call, Justice Hurwitz mentioned the incredible pace of activities throughout the courts. He stated that, in a perfect world, the progress made would be more deliberate, but we often find ourselves having to decide and accomplish a lot on the fly. He credited the progress that has been made to the capabilities of those in the courts as well as those gathered around the table and thanked everyone for the work they do. He then entertained a motion to adjourn.

MEETING ADJOURNED

11:45 A.M.

Upcoming Meetings:

November 5, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 119 A/B
February TBD, 2011	AOC – Conference Room TBD